Editor's Note

A Statement of Principles
The Occidental Quarterly

The following "Statement of Principles" summarizes the core beliefs and values that encompass the editorial outlook of The Occidental Quarterly. *The "Statement" below will appear in subsequent issues of* TOQ.

Since the fall of the Soviet Union major fissures have appeared in what is usually called "American conservatism." Chief among these is the conflict between "paleoconservatism" and "neoconservatism." Now a new, third school is emerging from the former. *The Occidental Quarterly* is an expression of that school and its exponents. To a greater or lesser degree, this constellation of ideas adheres to at least the following commitments:

1. The West is a cultural compound of our Classical, Christian, and Germanic past.

2. Race informs culture; it is the necessary precondition for cultural identity and integrity. In 1950 whites represented 30 percent of the world's population. If current trends persist, this number will plummet to 8 percent by 2050. In the United States, whites are projected to become a minority of the national population within fifty years. The result will impoverish not only their descendants but the world in general, and will jeopardize the civilization and free governments that whites have created.

3. America is part of the West and, as both a political and cultural order, is not "based on a creed" or "derived from a proposition." America is neither a "universal nation" nor an "experiment" concocted by ideologues. America is the unique and irreplaceable product of centuries of specific racial, historical, and cultural identities. America and its cultural and political identity will endure only so long as the identities that created it and sustain it endure, and when they die, America will die. We do not wish this to happen and will work to ensure it does not.

4. The European identity of the United States and its people should be maintained. Immigration into the United States should be restricted to selected people of European ancestry.

5. The perfectibility, let alone the equality, of man is not possible and is not a legitimate political aspiration. Political efforts to achieve or enforce perfectibility and equality invariably demand an unacceptable degree of coercion and result in unnecessary and unjust pain, suffering, and social disorder.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6. The political and personal freedoms of the American order—including our rights of free expression and association—are in jeopardy from ethnic and ideological enemies and must be preserved.

7. Federal decentralization and territorial separation should be recognized as legitimate and humane means of preventing and resolving divisive social, ethnic, and racial conflicts.

8. The quality of life rather than constant and perpetual increase in the material standard of living should be the emphasis of social and economic policy and public concern.

9. Imperial expansion, military crusades, and similar adventures to promote "global democracy" and "human rights" should be rejected.

10. The intervention of foreign states (Israel and Mexico, as well as others) in the internal politics and decision-making of the American people must be rejected.

The Editors and Publisher
November 11, 2003

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Who Are the War Agitators?

The Fight for an Independent Destiny and American Neutrality in World War II

Charles A. Lindbergh

Col. Charles Lindbergh remains, for many Americans, one of the nation's greatest heroes and patriots. A staunch opponent of America's entry into World War II, he became one of the most popular speakers at America First Committee gatherings across the country, addressing crowds of his concerned countrymen numerous enough to fill Madison Square Garden in New York City and Soldier Field in Chicago.

On September 11, 1941, Col. Lindbergh gave perhaps his most provocative speech to an America First Committee rally in Des Moines, Iowa. The central focus of this talk was a marked departure from his other addresses, for it identified three primary interest groups that were pressuring America into war: the British, Jewish organizations, and the Roosevelt administration. As official biographer A. Scott Berg points out in Lindbergh*:*

> *Lindbergh had long told himself that the moment American entry into the war seemed inevitable, he would drop a bombshell. He would publicly name "the groups that were most powerful and effective in pushing the United States toward involvement in the war." Having agreed to speak at another America First meeting, in Des Moines, he realized his engagement there would provide that moment. He penciled draft after draft of his most provocative speech yet, one bluntly titled, "Who Are the War Agitators?"*[1]

The reaction to Lindbergh's speech and the fallout that was to beset the America First Committee are well documented in Ruth Sarles's A Story of America First *(edited by Bill Kaufman), reviewed elsewhere in this issue of* TOQ*. Berg rightly lends the speech some much-needed perspective:*

> *In the end, Lindbergh had reduced his comments about the Jews to three paragraphs. They were the only public comments he ever made during the Great Debate in which he mentioned them. Although he felt he was showing his sympathy for a long-persecuted tribe, each additional sentence would be used to burn the brand of anti-Semite deeper into his public persona….*
>
> *Lindbergh had bent over backward to be kind about the Jews; but in suggesting the American Jews were "other" people and that their interests were "not American," he implied exclusion, thus undermining the very foundation of the United States.*[2]

The distorted image of Lindbergh that lingers is of a man who was rabidly anti-Semitic. Writers such as Gabriel Schoenfeld have fed this misperception over the years. In his recently published book, Jude: The Return of Anti-Semitism*, Schoenfeld argues:*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED